

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the Notice of Allowance dated June 18, 2012, and also the Notice of Allowance in related continuation App. No. 12/966,976 (“the child”) dated June 15, 2012. Applicant has filed the accompanying Request for Continued Examination in this application (“the parent”) for the purpose of returning the claims from the child back to the parent. The reason for this action by applicant is that the child appears to not be entitled to a patent term adjustment, despite the fact that the claims had been pending in the parent case for many years, were subject to most of the same delays as the parent, and had been presented and briefed on appeal in the parent. Applicant therefore reluctantly chooses this way to merge both cases, apologizes for the extra work for the Examiner, and asks for a quick issuance of a new Notice of Allowance.

Most of the claims in the child had been long pending in the parent, but were cancelled from the parent during appeal when indicated as allowable in the Examiner’s Answer, and re-filed as a continuation. The claims of both the child and parent were allowed over most of the same art after applicant’s successful appeal in the parent.

The new claims presented herein are mostly identical to the claims that have been allowed in the child. Claim 154 has been rewritten into dependent form.¹ The tracking of claims from the child back to the parent is as follows:

Claims in Child	New Claims in Parent
1-3	129-131
64-65	132-133
4-63	134-193

The following remarks are provided to clarify several statements made by the Examiner in the Reasons for Allowance of the child.

In describing the claim language which “the prior art does not teach or suggest,” the Examiner appears to have made at least two errors in reproducing claim language. For example, in the discussion of claims 8, 11, 13 and 24 on pages 3-4, the Examiner writes “transforming . . . into a second document, having document which permit

¹ Applicant added new claim 154 in dependent form, which makes it identical to cancelled claim 70 of the parent case and therefore dependent from claim 69.

editing of . . .” (emphasis added). The correct language from claim 8 recited in applicant’s amendment dated March 7, 2012 is “transforming . . . into a second document, having features which permit editing of . . .” (emphasis added). These claims are presented herein as claim numbers 138, 141, 143 and 154, with claim 154 rewritten into dependent form.

Also, in the discussion of claim 60 on page 4, the Examiner writes “thereby executing selected components on the computer and generating a generated document” (emphasis added). However, the “on the computer” limitation was removed in the amendment in the continuation case dated March 7, 2012. This claim is added as claim number 190.

Within both notices of allowance and with respect to many of the claims, the Examiner writes “. . . as best illustrated by FIG. 7.” Applicant notes that features recited in the claims are illustrated in various figures including Figs. 2, 7-9, 11, 18, 20-21, 23, 30 and 32.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 17, 2012

By: /Richard A. Nebb/
Richard A. Nebb
Reg. No. 33,540

DERGOSITS & NOAH LLP
3 Embarcadero Center, Suite 410
San Francisco, California 94111
Telephone: (415) 705-6377
Facsimile: (415) 705-6383
Email: rnebb@dergnoah.com